

QUANTUM HAMLET EFFECT- A NEW EXAMPLE

Vladan Panković

Department of Physics, Faculty of Sciences, 21000 Novi Sad,
Trg Dositeja Obradovića 4. , Serbia, vpankovic@if.ns.ac.yu

PACS number: 03.65.Ta

Abstract

In this work we consider a new example of the recently introduced quantum Hamlet effect. We consider an especial, abstract, "unstable" quantum system whose dynamical evolution during a small time interval is interrupted by frequent measurements. Here three different final situations exist. First one corresponds to quantum Zeno effect, second one - to quantum anti-Zeno effect and third one - to so-called quantum Hamlet effect. By quantum Zeno effect final "non-decay" probability is function of number of the decay measurements variable and "dynamical degree" parameter equivalent to two. When measurements number tends toward infinity "non-decay" probability has the one limit, or, it tends analytically toward one and system stands "non-decayed". By quantum anti-Zeno effect final "non-decay" probability is function of number of the decay measurements variable and "dynamical degree" parameter equivalent to one. When measurements number tends toward infinity "non-decay" probability has the zero limit, or, it tends analytically toward zero and system becomes "decayed". By quantum Hamlet effect, final "non-decay" probability is function of two variable, number of the decay measurements and "dynamical degree". When measurements number tends toward infinity and "dynamical degree" toward one, final "non-decay" probability depends not only of final value of given variables, but, also, on the ways on which given variables tends toward their final values. It means that final "no-decay" probability has not (analytical) limit, or that there is no *analytical* prediction on the final "no-decay" probability. To be "decayed" or "no-decayed" that is analytically unsolvable question for given quantum system.

*"Noise had ceased. I've slowly come out
To the stage, and leaning at the door,
Try to gasp in echo's distant sounds
What's prepared for me in my life's store.*

*But, it is defined - the actions order,
And the road's end cannot be sealed.
I am one, hypocrisy's all over
To cross life is not to cross field."*

Boris Pasternak, "Hamlet" (translated by Yevgeny Bonver)

In this work we shall consider a new example of the recently introduced quantum Hamlet effect [1]. We shall consider an especial, abstract, "unstable" quantum system with two states ("decayed" and "non-decayed"). (Abstract character of given system does not any influence on the generality of basic conclusion, since according to standard quantum mechanical formalism any correctly defined observable can, in principle, physically exist!) Its dynamical evolution (representing an analytical, deterministic process) during a small time interval is interrupted by frequent measurements (with discrete, probabilistic character). Here three different final situations exist. First one corresponds to quantum Zeno effect [2], second one - to quantum anti-Zeno effect [3] and third one - to so-called quantum Hamlet effect. By quantum Zeno effect final "non-decay" probability is function of number of the decay measurements variable and "dynamical degree" parameter equivalent to two. When measurements number tends toward infinity "non-decay" probability has the one limit, or, it tends analytically toward one and system stands "non-decayed". By quantum anti-Zeno effect final "non-decay" probability is function of number of the decay measurements variable and "dynamical degree" parameter equivalent to one. When measurements number tends toward infinity "non-decay" probability has the zero limit, or, it tends analytically toward zero and system becomes "decayed". By quantum Hamlet effect, final "non-decay" probability is function of two variable, number of the decay measurements and "dynamical degree". When measurements number tends toward infinity and "dynamical degree" toward one, final "non-decay" probability depends not only of final value of given variables, but, also, on the ways on which given variables tends toward their final values. It means that final "no-decay" probability has not (analytical) limit, or that there is no *analytical* prediction on the final "no-decay" probability. To be "decayed" or "no-decayed" that is analytically unsolvable question for given quantum system.

Consider an abstract, "unstable" quantum system with two time independent states, "non-decayed" - $|N\rangle$, and "decayed" - $|D\rangle$. Suppose that given states determine a complete basis B in the two-dimensional Hilbert space.

Suppose that given system is initially in the "non-decayed" state $|N\rangle$.

Suppose that given system, during a small time interval $[0, \tau]$, dynamically evolves in the final state representing the following superposition of the $|N\rangle$ and $|D\rangle$ states

$$|F\rangle = a(\tau)|N\rangle + b(\tau)|D\rangle. \quad (1)$$

Here $a(\tau)$ and $b(\tau)$ represents superposition coefficients that satisfy normalization condition. Suppose that it is satisfied

$$b(\tau) = \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau^{\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq \alpha \tau^k \ll 1 \quad (2)$$

which, according to normalization condition, implies

$$a(\tau) = (1 - \alpha \tau^k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq \alpha \tau^k \ll 1 \quad (3)$$

where α and k represent some positive parameters last of which will be called "dynamical degree".

Suppose that in the time moment t we measure "decay" non-degenerate observable with eigen basis B . Then, probability of the detection of given system in "non-decayed" state $|N\rangle$ after measurement equals

$$P_N(\tau, k) = 1 - \alpha \tau^k \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq \alpha \tau^k \ll 1. \quad (4)$$

Suppose that small time interval $[0, \tau]$ is divided in n smaller time sub-intervals any of which has length $\frac{\tau}{n}$. Realize at end of any time sub-interval, i.e. in any time moment $\frac{m\tau}{n}$ for $m = 1, 2, \dots, n$,

described measurement. Then, probability that given quantum system in the final time moment τ will be in the "non-decayed" state $|N\rangle$ equals

$$P_N^n(\frac{\tau}{n}, k) = (1 - \alpha(\frac{\tau}{n})^k)^n \simeq 1 - \alpha(\frac{\tau^k}{n^{k-1}}) \quad \text{for } n \gg 1. \quad (5)$$

Suppose that there is such dynamical evolution for which "dynamical degree" equals

$$k = 2. \quad (6)$$

Then (5) turns out in

$$P_N^n(\frac{\tau}{n}, k) \simeq 1 - \alpha \frac{\tau^2}{n} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{for } n \gg 1. \quad (7)$$

"Unstable" system, perturbed by frequent "decay" measurements, will not decay at all. As it is not hard to see this situation corresponds to usual quantum Zeno effect [1].

Suppose, further, that there is such dynamical evolution for which "dynamical degree" equals

$$k = 1. \quad (8)$$

Then (5) turns out in

$$P_N^n(\frac{\tau}{n}, k) \simeq 1 - \alpha\tau \simeq \exp[-\alpha\tau] \quad \text{for } n \gg 1. \quad (9)$$

"Unstable" system, perturbed by frequent "decay" measurements, holds large chance for "decay". As it is not hard to see this situation corresponds to usual quantum anti-Zeno effect [2].

Suppose, finally, that final "no-decay" probability (5) can be considered as a function of two variables, number of the decay measurements, n , and "dynamical degree", k . We shall prove that given function, in the general case, does not hold limit when n tends toward infinity and k toward 1. More precisely, we shall prove that final "non-decay" probability depends not only of the final value of given variables, but, also, on the way on which given variables tend toward their final values.

Suppose, simply, that k satisfies the following condition

$$k = 1 + \frac{\beta}{\gamma \ln[n]} \quad \text{for } 0 < \gamma < \beta < 1 \quad (10)$$

where β and γ represent arbitrary positive parameters that satisfy condition $0 < \gamma < \beta < 1$. Obviously, for different β and γ , or, precisely, for different quotient $\frac{\beta}{\gamma}$, "dynamical degree" k tends toward 1 when number of the measurements n tends toward infinity.

Also, expression (10) is equivalent to

$$n = \exp[\frac{\beta}{\gamma(k-1)}] \quad \text{for } 0 < \gamma < \beta < 1. \quad (11)$$

Obviously, for different β and γ , or, precisely, for different quotient $\frac{\beta}{\gamma}$, number of the measurements n tends toward infinity when "dynamical degree" k tends toward 1.

Introduction of (10), (11) in (5) yields

$$P_N^n(\frac{\tau}{n}, k) \simeq 1 - \alpha\tau^{1+\frac{\beta}{\gamma \ln[n]}} \exp[-\frac{\beta}{\gamma}] \quad (12)$$

Then, as it is not hard to see, limit of (12), when n tends toward infinity, equals

$$L \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_N^n\left(\frac{\tau}{n}, k\right) = 1 - \alpha\tau \exp\left[-\frac{\beta}{\gamma}\right]. \quad (13)$$

Obviously, values of L can be different for different β and γ , precisely different quotient $\frac{\beta}{\gamma}$. It means that given limit depends of the way on which k tends toward 1.

In this way it is proved that final "no-decay" probability (5) as a function of two variables, measurements number n and "dynamical degree" k , does not hold limit when n tends toward infinity and k toward 1. Or, there is no quantum analytical prediction on the final "no-decay" probability in this case. To be "decayed" or "no-decayed" that is the unsolvable question for given quantum system. It represents quantum Hamlet effect.

In conclusion the following can be repeated and pointed out. In this work we consider an especial, abstract, "unstable" quantum system whose dynamical evolution during a small time interval is interrupted by frequent measurements. Except analog of quantum Zeno effect and quantum anti-Zeno effect there is a new, so-called quantum Hamlet effect. By quantum Hamlet effect, final "non-decay" probability is function of two variable, number of the decay measurements and "dynamical degree". When frequent measurement tends toward infinity and "dynamical degree" toward one, final "non-decay" probability depends not only from final value of given variables, but, also, from the ways on which given variables tends toward their final values. It means that final "no-decay" probability has not limit, or that there is no analytical prediction on the final "no-decay" probability. To be "decayed" or "no-decayed" that is analytically unsolvable question for given quantum system. Or, to cross quantum life is not to cross field.

Author is deeply grateful to Ilmari Karonen and Sergio Boixo for critical remarks of the mathematical details of previous version of quantum Hamlet effect [1].

References

- [1] V. Pankovic, *Quantum Hamlet effect*, quant-ph/0908.1301
- [2] B. Misra, C. J. G. Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys. **18** (1977) 756
- [3] B. Kaulakys, V. Gontis, Phys. Rev. A **56** (1997) 1131